International Journal of Modern Physics A
© World Scientific Publishing Company

arXiv:gr-qc/0501058v1 19 Jan 2005

Noncommutative scalar field minimally coupled to gravity*

Orfeu Bertolami†

Instituto Superior Técnico, Departamento de Física
Av. Rovisco Pais 1, Lisbon, 1049-001, Portugal

A model for noncommutative scalar fields coupled to gravity based on the generalization of the Moyal product is proposed. Solutions compatible with homogeneous and isotropic flat Robertson-Walker spaces to first non-trivial order in the perturbation of the star-product are presented. It is shown that in the context of a typical chaotic inflationary scenario, at least in the slow-roll regime, noncommutativity yields no observable effect.

Keywords: Noncommutative geometry; gravity; scalar fields.

PACS numbers: 98.80-Cq, 04.50+h

Dedicated to the memory of Luís Guisado

1. Introduction

The idea of noncommuting spatial coordinates is actually quite old and has been suggested by Snyder[1] about the time Quantum Field Theory itself was emerging as a consistent description of the fundamental interactions. More recently, noncommutative geometry has been systematized by Connes[2] and Woronowicz[3], via the generalized concept of differential structure of generic ($C^\star$)-algebras. This formulation has been proposed as a possible formulation for quantum gravity via noncommutative differential calculus[4]. In another fundamental setting, it has been pointed out by Seiberg and Witten[5], that noncommutative geometry arises in the context of string theory, which has naturally motivated a great interest in the subject.

This interest has led to the construction of noncommutative field theories through the Moyal deformation of the product of functions, which defines a noncommutative algebra[6,7]. In this type of setup the issues of unitarity[8] and renormalizability cannot be fully understood, as the resulting particle physics models are regarded as effective theories, even though, to some extent, interesting bounds on the magnitude of the noncommutative parameter can be obtained[9].

*Talk presented at the Workshop on Quantum Gravity and Noncommutative Geometry, 20-23 July 2004, Universidade Lusófona, Lisbon, Portugal.

†E-mail: orfeu@cosmos.ist.utl.pt

In this contribution the implications of the generalization of the noncommutative algebra for the multiplication of tensors that are minimally coupled to a classical gravity field[10] is studied. It is hoped that this noncommutative algebra approach may provide some insight into the physics of the Planck scale. As it will be seen, interestingly, this setting can be tested via its impact in inflationary models and, hence, on the Gaussian character of energy density fluctuations or on the isotropy of the observables. Noncommutativity of coordinates introduces a new fundamental length scale whose imprint may turn out, thanks the intervention of inflation, to have some observational consequences[11,12]. The approach suggested here is similar to the study of Ref. [13], even though differences in details lead to somewhat different conclusions. Most remarkably, it is found that within a perturbation approach in an homogeneous and isotropic background metric, the impact of noncommutativity in the context of the chaotic inflationary model[14] is negligible.

Another fundamental issue that has been much discussed in the context of noncommutative field theories concerns the breaking of Lorentz invariance[15]. Actually, the possibility that this fundamental symmetry of Nature is broken has been widely discussed in the recent literature[16]. Indeed, the spontaneous breaking of Lorentz symmetry may arise in string/M-theory due to non-trivial vacuum solutions in string field theory[17], in loop quantum gravity[18], in quantum gravity inspired spacetime foam scenarios[19], or via the spacetime variation of fundamental coupling constants[20]. The breaking of Lorentz symmetry can, at least in principle, be tested in studies of ultra-high energy cosmic rays[21].

In this work it is shown that Lorentz invariance may hold at least at first nontrivial order in perturbation theory of the noncommutative parameter[10]. Actually, the idea that the noncommutative parameter may be a Lorentz tensor has been considered in some field theory models[22].

The work in which this contribution is based has been developed in collaboration with Luís Guisado. Luís was tragically killed in a car accident on June 28th, 2003. He was a brilliant 23 years old graduate student and a hope of the young generation of Portuguese theoretical physicists. I dedicate this contribution to his memory.

2. Generalized Moyal Product

Noncommutativity in Minkowski can be introduced via the so-called noncommutative Moyal product defined as

$$T * W\left(x\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(i/2)^n}{n!} \theta^{\alpha_1\beta_1} \ldots \theta^{\alpha_n\beta_n} \left(T_{,\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_n}\right) \left(W_{,\beta_1\ldots\beta_n}\right) \ , \tag{1}$$

where T and W are generic tensors whose indices have been suppressed, the primes denote partial derivatives and $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ is often taken to be a constant. Aiming to preserve Lorentz symmetry to start with, we consider $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ as a spacetime dependent antisymmetric Lorentz tensor. Thus, the commutator between coordinates is given

by

$$[x^\mu, x^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu}(x) \ . \tag{2}$$

Thus, our suggestion in order to preserve general covariance is to consider instead the following generalized Moyal product

$$T * W\,(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{(i/2)^n}{n!} \theta^{\alpha_1\beta_1} \ldots \theta^{\alpha_n\beta_n} \left(T_{;\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_n}\right) \left(W_{;\beta_1\ldots\beta_n}\right) \ , \tag{3}$$

where the semicolon denotes covariant derivative with respect to the Levi-Civita connection and $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ is a non-constant rank-2 antisymmetric tensor. This proposal, despite of being non-associative in general, implies that this property may be recovered to some extent for a scalar field, Φ, through the condition $\theta^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_{;\alpha} = 0$.

By use of the antisymmetry of $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ one can easily show that, under conjugation, $(T * W)^* = W^* * T^*$. The compatibility of the metric yields $g^{\mu\nu} * T = g^{\mu\nu} T$ so that the operation of raising and lowering of indices is not affected by noncommutativity.

Noncommutative Lagrangian densities are obtained by substituting the usual products into star-products so that one has to evaluate integrals of the form

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\ T^* * W \ . \tag{4}$$

Integrating by parts and dropping surface terms, one can arrange the covariant derivatives on the star-product to act either on T or on W, that is

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\ T^* \left(\mathcal{A}W\right) = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(\mathcal{A}T\right)^* W \ , \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is an Hermitian operator given by

$$\mathcal{A}W = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{(-i/2)^n}{n!} \left[\theta^{\alpha_1\beta_1} \ldots \theta^{\alpha_n\beta_n} \left(W_{;\beta_1\ldots\beta_n}\right)\right]_{;\alpha_n\ldots\alpha_1} \ . \tag{6}$$

In the case the Lagrangian density is quadratic on the tensor T one can use the property under conjugation to demonstrate that $T * T$ is real, and therefore that

$$S' = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\ T * T = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g} T \left(\frac{\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}^*}{2}\right) T \equiv \int d^4x\sqrt{-g} T \mathcal{O} T \ , \tag{7}$$

where the Hermitian operator $\mathcal{O} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}^*\right)$ has been introduced

$$\mathcal{O}W = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{(-1/4)^n}{(2n)!} \left[\theta^{\alpha_1\beta_1} \ldots \theta^{\alpha_{2n}\beta_{2n}} \left(W_{;\beta_1\ldots\beta_{2n}}\right)\right]_{;\alpha_{2n}\ldots\alpha_1} \ . \tag{8}$$

3. Noncommutative scalar field coupled to gravity

3.1. *Massive scalar field*

The noncommutative action for a massive scalar field, Φ, is quadratic, and so, from the previous results

$$S = -\tfrac{1}{2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[\nabla^\mu\Phi\mathcal{O}\nabla_\mu\Phi + m^2\Phi\mathcal{O}\Phi\right] \ ; \tag{9}$$

the equation of motion being given by

$$\nabla^\mu \mathcal{O} \nabla_\mu \Phi - m^2 \mathcal{O} \Phi = 0 \ . \tag{10}$$

The Hermitian operator $\mathcal{O}$ naturally arises in the equations of motion, corresponding to an observable of the scalar field. In the commutative limit, $lim_{\theta \to 0} \mathcal{O} = 1$. On the other hand, switching off gravity and admitting that $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ is constant, yields $\mathcal{O} = 1$, since the partial derivatives commute and are contracted with the antisymmetric tensor $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ in Eq. (8). Thus, in this model noncommutativity arises only through the coupling to gravity. This has its origin on the fact that the usual Moyal product obeys, under integration, the cyclic property

$$\int d^4x \, f * g = \int d^4x \, f \, g = \int d^4x \, g * f \ . \tag{11}$$

3.2. *Scalar field with an arbitrary potential*

We consider now the noncommutative generalization of an arbitrary analytic commutative potential $V(\Phi)$. Associativity played no role in the case of a massive scalar field because one dealt with a quadratic action. Now, however, for an arbitrary potential, in general, the resulting star-product is not associative.

Given a commutative analytic potential

$$V(\Phi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{n!} \Phi^n \ , \tag{12}$$

its corresponding noncommutative version has the form

$$V_{NC}(\Phi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{n!} \overbrace{\Phi * \ldots * \Phi}^{n \ factors} \ , \tag{13}$$

provided the corresponding action of the star-product upon powers of the scalar field is associative. This generalization is considered for the case where $\theta^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_{,\beta} = 0$.

Since there is no a priori associativity, let us consider the sequence

$$s_2 = (\Phi * \Phi) \qquad s_{n+1} = \Phi * s_n \ , \quad n > 2 \ . \tag{14}$$

It is not difficult to prove that, up to second order,

$$s_n \simeq \Phi^n + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \Phi^{n-2} \, (\Phi \hat{*} \Phi) \tag{15}$$

where it is natural to define

$$\varphi \hat{*} \chi \equiv -\tfrac{1}{8} \theta^{\alpha_1 \beta_1} \theta^{\alpha_2 \beta_2} \, (\varphi_{;\alpha_1 \alpha_2}) \, (\chi_{;\beta_1 \beta_2}) \ . \tag{16}$$

Moreover, for every m and n, one can show that, up to second order,

$$s_n * s_m \simeq s_{m+n} \ , \tag{17}$$

which demonstrates that one can compute the power s_q grouping q star-products in any combination one wishes. Therefore, the star-product of powers of Φ turns out to be associative. These results allow writing

$$V_{NC}\left(\Phi\right) \equiv V\left(\Phi\right) + \tfrac{1}{2}V''\left(\Phi\right)\left(\Phi\hat{*}\Phi\right) \ , \tag{18}$$

so that $' = d/d\Phi$.

The variation of the potential V_{NC} in the action yields

$$-\frac{\delta S_{pot}}{\delta\Phi} = V' + \tfrac{1}{2}V'''\left(\Phi\hat{*}\Phi\right) - \tfrac{1}{4}\mathcal{F}\left[V,\Phi\right] \ , \tag{19}$$

where the operator has been defined

$$\mathcal{F}\left[V,\Phi\right] \equiv \left[\tfrac{1}{2}V''\theta^{\alpha_1\beta_1}\theta^{\alpha_2\beta_2}\phi_{;\beta_1\beta_2}\right]_{;\alpha_2\alpha_1} \ . \tag{20}$$

With this definition one also finds that

$$\mathcal{O}\Phi_{;\mu} \simeq \Phi_{;\mu} - \tfrac{1}{8}\mathcal{F}\left[\Phi^2,\Phi_{;\mu}\right] \ . \tag{21}$$

3.3. *Homogeneous and Isotropic Spacetime*

In what follows it is assumed that gravity is described by the Einstein-Hilbert action being therefore unaffected by noncommutativity. The aim of this proposal is to study the impact of the noncommutative algebra of tensors on a non-trivial spacetime background. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that there is no canonical way of introducing the noncommutative algebra within the geometrical formulation of gravity, namely in the Riemann tensor and, ultimately, in the Ricci scalar. It the follows that the Einstein equations in the presence of a noncommutative scalar field are given by

$$R_{\alpha\beta} = -8\pi k\left[\tfrac{1}{2}\nabla_{\{\alpha}\Phi\mathcal{O}\nabla_{\beta\}}\Phi + g_{\alpha\beta}V_{NC}\left(\Phi\right)\right]. \tag{22}$$

As a concrete model, we analyze a homogeneous and isotropic space-time described by the spatially flat Robertson-Walker metric

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + R^2\left(t\right)\left(dx^2+dy^2+dz^2\right) \ , \tag{23}$$

where $R(t)$ is the scale factor. The non-vanishing components of the Christoffel symbols are the following

$$\Gamma^t_{\ ij} = R\dot{R}\delta_{ij} \qquad \Gamma^i_{\ jt} = \frac{\dot{R}}{R}\delta^i_{\ j} \tag{24}$$

and, as is well known, the Ricci tensor is diagonal:

$$R_{tt} = 3\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} \qquad R_{ij} = -\left(R\ddot{R}+2\dot{R}^2\right)\delta_{ij} \ . \tag{25}$$

The non-trivial components of the antisymmetric noncommutative tensor, $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$, correspond to two 3-vectors which we denote by $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$, in analogy with the electromagnetic tensor. The following notation is used:

$$\theta^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -E_x & -E_y & -E_z \\ E_x & 0 & -B_z & B_y \\ E_y & B_z & 0 & -B_x \\ E_z & -B_y & B_x & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{26}$$

It is relevant to point out that, even if $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ is homogeneous, $\theta^{\alpha\beta} = \theta^{\alpha\beta}(t)$, it is still quite possible that symmetry under rotations is broken and some attention should be paid concerning the choice of an isotropic Ansatz for the metric, as $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ can give rise to preferred directions in space. It can be shown, however, that there is a noncommutative model consistent with homogeneity and isotropy to first order in perturbation theory, for the homogeneous scalar field, $\partial_i \Phi = 0$. Under these conditions, it follows from Eqs. (10) and (22) that

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 3\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\dot{\Phi} + V' = \frac{\partial_t \left(R^3 \mathcal{F}\left[\Phi^2, \Phi_{;t}\right]\right)}{8R^3} + \tfrac{1}{2}V'''\left(\Phi \hat{*} \Phi\right) + \tfrac{1}{4}\mathcal{F}\left[V, \Phi\right] \ , \tag{27}$$

$$\left(\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi k}{3}\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 + V + \tfrac{1}{2}V''\left(\Phi \hat{*} \Phi\right) - \tfrac{1}{16}\dot{\Phi}\mathcal{F}\left[\Phi^2, \dot{\Phi}\right]\right) . \tag{28}$$

The interested reader can find the explicit computation of these terms in the Appendix of Ref. [10], the results being:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \hat{*} \Phi &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\left(R\dot{R}\dot{\Phi}B\right)^2 \ , \\ \mathcal{F}\left[V, \Phi\right] &= \tfrac{1}{2R^3}\partial_t\left[R^5\dot{R}^2\dot{\Phi}B^2\tfrac{1}{2}V''\right] \ , \\ \mathcal{F}\left[\Phi^2, \dot{\Phi}\right] &= -\tfrac{2}{R^3}\partial_t\left[R^6\dot{R}^2B^2\partial_t\left(\tfrac{\dot{\Phi}}{R}\right)\right] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where the condition $\vec{E} = 0$ [23] has been used. This condition ensures that $\theta^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_{;\beta} = 0$ and that the noncommutative generalization of the scalar potential Eq. (18) makes sense. Hence we see that the dependence of Eqs. (29) in $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ occurs only via B^2 and consequently invariance under rotations is preserved. Since the dynamics of the $\vec{B}$ field is unknown, we consider, the logical choice

$$B^2 = \hat{B}^2 R^{-2\varepsilon}, \tag{30}$$

where $\hat{B}^2$ is a constant. The parameter ε will be determined in the next section.

4. Slow-roll in Chaotic Inflation

Since the effects of noncommutativity are expected to manifest at high energies, it is quite natural to study its influence in the inflationary process. Given the generality of conditions for the onset of inflation, chaotic models [14] are particularly suited for studying the effect of noncommutativity. We look for solutions of Eqs. (27) and (28)

in first order of perturbation theory in $\hat{B}^2$, considering solutions of the following form

$$\Phi = \phi + \hat{B}^2\varphi \qquad R = a + \hat{B}^2\chi \ , \tag{31}$$

where Φ and a are solutions of the unperturbed (commutative) problem, while φ and χ are arbitrary time dependent functions to be determined. We neglect in every step higher order terms in $\hat{B}^2$. Using units in which $k = 1$, Eqs. (27) and (28) assume the form

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 3\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\dot{\Phi} + V' = \hat{B}^2 f \ , \tag{32}$$

$$\left(\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 + V\right) + \frac{8\pi}{3}\hat{B}^2 g \ , \tag{33}$$

in terms of functions f and g which are specified below. Standard perturbation procedure yields the usual inflationary equations

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\phi} + V'(\phi) = 0 \ , \tag{34}$$

$$\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}\left[\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi)\right] \ . \tag{35}$$

The onset of inflation and slow-roll regime are achieved once the following conditions are satisfied

$$\frac{V'}{V} \leq \sqrt{48\pi} \quad , \quad \frac{V''}{V} \leq 24\pi \ , \tag{36}$$

so that we can drop the term $\ddot{\phi}$ in the Eq. (34) and the kinetic term of the scalar field in Eq. (35). Hence, the useful condition arises

$$\left|\dot{\phi}\right| \leq \sqrt{2}V^{1/2}. \tag{37}$$

It then follows that terms in Eqs. (29) can be estimated using the slow-roll conditions and one finds[10] that all of them are proportional to $a^{4-2\varepsilon}$ and to factors that depend on V and $\dot{\phi}$. Naturally, since during inflation the Universe is expanding exponentially, the perturbation theory is meaningful only if $\varepsilon \geq 2$. However, if $\varepsilon > 2$ it implies that the terms in Eqs. (29) decay so swiftly that noncommutativity will have no impact. Therefore, it can be concluded from the consistency of perturbation theory that $\varepsilon = 2$. Notice, that this is a quite natural choice from the theoretical point of view. Indeed, most of the studied noncommutative models consider a constant $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$; thus requiring that this is so for the physical coordinates $y^i = R\,x^i$, then one finds, from Eq. (2), $\left[y^i, y^j\right] = \hat{B}^{ij}$, implying that $\varepsilon = 2$.

The equations for the perturbed terms are obtained gathering all terms proportional to $\hat{B}^2$ and it follows that this constant cancels out from the differential equations. Function φ satisfies the relationship

$$f - 4\pi\frac{\dot{\phi}}{\dot{a}/a}g = \ddot{\varphi} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left[1 + \frac{4\pi}{3}\left(\frac{\dot{\phi}}{\dot{a}/a}\right)^2\right]\dot{\varphi} + V''\left[1 + 4\pi\frac{V'}{V''}\frac{\dot{\phi}}{\dot{a}/a}\right]\varphi\ , \qquad (38)$$

where functions f and g can be computed using the slow-roll conditions[10]:

$$\begin{aligned} |f| &\leq \tfrac{1}{2}a_1V^2V'' + \tfrac{1}{2}a_2V^2V''' + a_3V^3 + a_4V^{5/2}, \\ |g| &\leq a_5V^3 + \tfrac{1}{2}a_6V^2V'', \end{aligned} \qquad (39)$$

with $a_1 \simeq 85.5$, $a_2 \simeq a_6 \simeq 4.2$, $a_3 \simeq 3.30\times10^3$, $a_4 \simeq 4.52\times10^3$ and $a_5 \simeq 1.76\times10^2$.

To further proceed, it should be reminded that potentials in chaotic inflation are characterized by a small overall coupling constant, $\lambda \simeq 10^{-14}$, so to ensure consistency with the amplitude of energy density perturbations around 10^{-5}, for ϕ field values of a few Planck units. Thus, writing the potential as

$$V(\Phi) = \lambda\, v(\Phi)\,, \qquad (40)$$

and as

$$v \leq 10^2, \qquad (41)$$

it implies that $|f| \leq 4.5\times10^{-27}$ and $|g| \leq 1.8\times10^{-34}$, while the second and the third terms of the right-hand side of Eq. (38) are of the order 2.5×10^{-6} and 7×10^{-11}, respectively. Hence, for numerical purposes, the left-hand side of the Eq. (38) is vanishingly small and in this case, one obtains essentially the same differential equation that would arise when performing perturbation theory on the standard slow-roll approximation with no extra physics. The conclusion is that noncommutativity introduces no change in inflationary slow-roll physics for the inflaton field in the context of the chaotic model.

Moreover, from the equation for the χ perturbation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{\chi}{a}\right) = \frac{4\pi}{3\dot{a}/a}\left(\dot{\phi}\dot{\varphi} + V'\varphi + g\right) \qquad (42)$$

one finds that the upper limit for $|g|$ implies that this equation is not changed as well. Thus, one can conclude that the results of the perturbation approach indicate that the noncommutative aspects of the proposed model yield no impact on the chaotic inflationary model.

5. Conclusions

In this contribution we have studied the physics of a noncommutative scalar field coupled to gravity via an extension of the Moyal product. The general features of the formalism were developed and its application in the context of a spatially flat

Robertson-Walker metric were obtained. Results were found through perturbation methods, which necessarily require that the antisymmetric noncommutative tensor, $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$, is small compared to the covariant derivative of the fields. It has been shown that although there exists no equation for $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$, both perturbation theory and theoretical considerations, allow concluding that $\theta^{\alpha\beta} \sim R^{-2}$, where R is the scale factor.

The antisymmetric tensor $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ can be parameterized by two three-vectors, just like in the case of the electromagnetic tensor (c.f. Eq. (26)). The homogeneity requirement, that is, $\partial_i \theta^{\alpha\beta} = 0$, could still lead to preferred directions in space rendering the Robertson-Walker metric Ansatz meaningless. Nevertheless, it is shown that, at least in first order in perturbation theory, that does not occur since the terms arising from noncommutative contributions depend only on the rotationally invariants E^2 and B^2.

Furthermore, in the context of the slow-roll regime of a typical chaotic inflation, it is shown that noncommutativity introduces negligible effects. This is due mainly to two reasons. First, the scale parameter does not appear in the first order terms as $\theta^{\alpha\beta} \sim R^{-2}$, otherwise these would grow exponentially rendering perturbation theory meaningless. On the other hand, the slow-roll conditions induce small derivative terms for the inflaton field, Eq. (37), and for the logarithm of the scale factor, Eq. (35). Since the Moyal product is highly non-local as it involves many derivatives, the smallness of the noncommutative contributions is a natural implication. In other words: as perturbation theory requires that $\theta^{\alpha\beta}$ is small compared to the the derivative terms and these are themselves quite small. Thus, one is led to conclude that noncommutative effects, if any, must arise beyond the perturbation regime.

In summary, one can say that the present calculations assume that perturbation theory is valid from a given cosmological time t_* onward; thus, if the conditions for inflation are met and $B = \hat{B} R^{-2}$, then noncommutativity has no impact in the chaotic inflationary scenario. This implies that $B_* = \hat{B} R_*^{-2} \ll 1$, or $\hat{B} \ll R_*^2$, and therefore, a small $\hat{B}$ ensures the validity of perturbation theory for any given R_*. It is important to realize that the constant $\hat{B}$ cancels out in the perturbed differential equations, so its magnitude plays no role on the smallness of the extra terms in Eqs. (38) and (42). These terms, on their turn, are small as they involve high-order derivatives of the scalar potential which has a small coupling constant.

Prior to t_*, no model for B is proposed. Actually, even if the expression $B = \hat{B} R^{-2}$ or any other one with a singularity for B at $R = 0$ holds, this would occur before perturbation theory is valid. However, if t_* coincides with the onset of inflation, then the physics prior to t_* has negligible impact, as chaotic initial conditions are satisfied.

There is also another scenario in which these considerations might remain valid. If beyond perturbation effects allow for inflation, then it is feasible that initially inflation is driven by noncommutativity and, at a later time, by the mechanism discussed here.

6. Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank the colleagues Nuno Dias, Aleksandar Mikovic and João Prata as well as the Departamento de Matemática e Ciências da Computação da Universidade Lusófona for the organization of the Workshop on Quantum Gravity and Noncommutative Geometry, a most interesting and pleasant meeting.

References

1. H.S. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.* **71** (1947) 38.
2. A. Connes, *Inst. Hautes tudes Sci. Publ. Math.* **62** (1985) 257.
3. S.L. Woronowicz, *Pub. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **23** (1987) 117.
4. J.C. Várilly, hep-th/0206007.
5. N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *JHEP* **9909** (1999) 032.
6. R.J. Szabo, *Phys.Rept* **378** (2003) 207.
7. M.R. Douglas and N.A. Nekrasov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73** (2001) 997.
8. D. Bahns, S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen and G. Piacitelli, *Phys. Lett.* **B533** (2002) 178.
9. J.L. Hewett, F.J. Petriello and T.G. Rizzo, *Phys. Rev.* **D66** (2002) 036001.
10. O. Bertolami and L. Guisado, *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 025001.
11. F. Lizzi, G. Mangano, G. Miele and G. Sparano, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A11** (1996) 2907.
12. C.S. Chu, B.R. Greene and G. Shiu, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A16** (2001) 2231.
13. F. Lizzi, G.Mangano, G. Miele and M. Peloso, *JHEP* **0206** (2002) 049.
14. A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett.* **B129** (1983) 177.
15. S.M. Carroll, J.A. Harvey, V.A. Kostelecký, C.D. Lane and T.Okamoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 141601.
16. V.A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 105009; O. Bertolami, *Gen. Relat. Gravit.* **34** (2002) 707; hep-ph/0301191; R. Lehnert, hep-ph/0312093.
17. V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. **D39** (1989) 683; Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 224; V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, *Phys. Rev.* **D51**, 3923 (1995); *Phys. Lett.* **B381**, 389 (1996).
18. R. Gambini and J. Pullin, *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 124021; J. Alfaro, H.A. Morales-Tecotl and L.F. Urrutia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** (2000) 2183.
19. L.J. Garay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 2508; J.R. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Gen. Relat. Gravit.* **31** (1999) 1257.
20. V.A. Kostelecký, R. Lehnert and M. J. Perry, *Phys. Rev.* **D68** (2003) 123511; O. Bertolami, R. Lehnert, R. Potting and A. Ribeiro, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 083513.
21. H. Sato and T. Tati, *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **47** (1972) 1788; S. Coleman and S.L. Glashow, *Phys. Lett.* **B405** (1997) 249; *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 116008; L. Gonzales-Mestres, hep-ph/9905430; O. Bertolami and C.S. Carvalho, *Phys. Rev.* **D61** (2000) 103002; G. Amelino-Camelia and T. Piran, *Phys. Lett.* **B497** (2001) 265.
22. O. Bertolami and L. Guisado, *JHEP* **0312** (2003) 013; S. Imai and N. Sasakura, *JHEP* **0009** (2000) 032; J. Conroy, H.J. Kwee and V. Nazaryan, *Phys. Rev.* **D68** (2003) 054004; D. Robbins and S. Sethi, *JHEP* **0307** (2003) 034.
23. Some authors suggest that unitarity requires $\vec{E} = 0$ (see e.g. [13] and references therein).